



(Re-)negotiating the process of staying in superdiverse places

Journal:	<i>Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies</i>
Manuscript ID	CJMS-2019-0541.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Superdiverse, Neighbourhood, Staying, Diversity, Relational

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

(Re-)negotiating the process of staying in superdiverse places

Abstract: Little attention has been focused on how the differing features of ‘superdiverse’ neighbourhoods shape the demographic process of ‘staying’. Through drawing on research conducted in two different superdiverse neighbourhoods in the city of Birmingham, UK, the paper highlights how ‘staying’ is an inherent feature of superdiverse neighbourhoods and which is actively practised by migrants and non-migrants alike. Empirically, the paper identifies how staying is informed by a number of features associated with superdiverse neighbourhoods, such as local infrastructure and visible population diversity, as well as relational proximity to other areas of the city, including the significance of city centre spaces and their role as multicultural spaces of adaptation. Conceptually, the paper informs recent work on ‘arrival infrastructures’ and ‘differentiated embedding’ for migrant (and non-migrant) settlement and provides new insights into the territorial, relational and temporal aspects of staying. This includes the importance of neighbourhood histories in staying processes and which hitherto have been relatively neglected.

Keywords: Superdiverse neighbourhoods, staying, diversity, temporal, relational

1. Introduction

This paper provides original and significant new insights into examining the demographic process of ‘staying’ in areas of superdiversity. To date, such areas have been characterized as being in a constant state of flux whereby a *proportion of the population is perpetually new* (Phillimore 2015, Author, 2018; italics added). However, this paper challenges such a perspective by bringing staying and immobility to the fore. It highlights the importance of differing characteristics of superdiverse places in shaping staying processes and in so doing identifies spatial dimensions to staying. As such, the paper challenges staying as residual to migration and (hyper-)mobility (Stockdale and Haartsen 2018).

Research concerned with mobility and migration has frequently devalued staying as an active agent-centred process and which is often an integral element of a life strategy involving other people or places (Coulter et al. 2016, Urry 2007). Equally, the importance of place has been largely absent from existing discussions on staying (see Antonsich 2010 for a notable exception). Such concerns are brought together in this paper through a focus on superdiverse places. Whilst Beck and Grande (2010) identify how allegiances and identities of individuals are increasingly de-territorialized and formed outside of place, the emergence of superdiverse places – arising from migration-driven diversification - highlights how migratory practices are embodied territorially as well as being shaped relationally (Vertovec 2019).

Drawing on research conducted in two different superdiverse neighbourhoods in a UK city characterized by the increasing superdiversification of its population (Birmingham, United Kingdom - UK), the paper makes four original and important contributions. First, the paper examines the characteristics of superdiverse places in shaping staying. Second, the paper

1
2
3 adopts a ‘whole community’ approach to consider both migrants and non-migrants living in
4
5 superdiverse neighbourhoods. This is important as whilst superdiversity draws attention to
6
7 new social complexities arising from migration-driven diversification (Vertovec 2019, 125), a
8
9 focus on non-migrants living in superdiverse areas is often missing from many analyses.
10
11 Third, the paper considers the importance of relational spaces and neighbourhood histories to
12
13 staying processes in superdiverse neighbourhoods. It explores how staying is shaped with
14
15 reference to other spaces elsewhere – and particularly city centre spaces – as well as
16
17 individuals comparing their current situation to previous experiences in other
18
19 neighbourhoods. This is novel, as most work to date on neighbourhood histories and previous
20
21 experiences of diversity has focused on either migrant’s countries of origin, or in places of
22
23 transit migration (Leitner 2012; Hoekstra and Pinkster 2017). Finally, through reference to
24
25 recent work on ‘arrival cities’ (e.g. see Saunders, 2011), ‘arrival infrastructures’ (e.g. see
26
27 Meeus et al., 2019) and differentiated processes of migrant embedding (Ryan, 2018), the
28
29 paper makes a broader contribution to literature on place and settlement. In particular, it
30
31 identifies the need for a greater consideration of the territorial, relational and temporal aspects
32
33 of arrival structures and the embedding processes of migrants and non-migrants alike.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 **2. Framing mobility and staying in superdiverse neighbourhoods**

43 ***2.1 Mobility, place and staying***

44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51 Over time, approaches to mobility have evolved to consider the ways in which it shapes
52
53 people’s identities and everyday lives and the experiences and significance of movement
54
55 (Cresswell 2006). Through drawing attention to the emergence of a ‘new critical mobilities
56
57 paradigm’, Urry (2000) identifies how the temporalities and spatialities of mobility have been
58
59
60

1
2
3 reconsidered. Importantly, mobility is now viewed as relational and involving rhythms,
4 trajectories and synchronicities with other people and objects (Adey 2010). Mobility can
5 shape and produce the fluidity of place (Merriman 2012; Urry 2007), economically,
6 politically and culturally and through the “multiple mobilities of people, capital, objects, signs
7 and information” (adapted from Urry 2007, 269). Mobility and immobility are also shaped by
8 each other: there are complex relations between mobility and immobility and with mobility
9 enabled by immobility and vice versa (Milbourne and Kitchen 2014).

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 However, whilst migration research has traditionally centred on tracing movement and
22 mobility there has been much less focus to date on the experiences and practices associated
23 with immobility and staying in place (Morse and Mudgett 2018). In this respect, the dominant
24 focus of mobility studies to date has been on urban places – and with the urban being
25 perceived as the archetypal space of hypermobility (Cresswell and Merriman 2011). In
26 contrast, immobility or staying has been more closely connected with rural spaces. Staying
27 processes have increasingly been understood as relational and contextual and linked to the
28 biographies and experiences of individuals, including past experiences and future aspirations
29 (Coulter et al. 2013; Kley and Mulder 2010). Nevertheless, in a rural context, immobility and
30 staying have overwhelmingly been connected with a failure to leave (Looker and Naylor
31 2009) and with studies of migration and mobility devaluing the agency involved with staying
32 (Coulter et al. 2016). Moreover, a lack of mobility, according to Faist (2013), has connoted
33 stasis, decline and disadvantage. Consequently, Stockdale and Haartsen (2018) have
34 advocated the need for a greater focus on immobility and staying in a range of contexts –
35 urban and rural - and to re-conceptualize staying as an active process subject to continual (re-
36)negotiation.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The importance of place in shaping immobility and staying also needs to be recognized.
4
5 Studies of migration and mobility have highlighted how places are the product of ‘roots’ and
6
7 ‘routes’, and are the sites of multiple identities and histories (Massey 2005; Author 2018). A
8
9 critical mobilities approach has identified how in an increasingly hyper-mobile world places
10
11 are relational, not bounded, never finished and involving an intersection of flows, people and
12
13 objects – a “constellation of processes” (Massey 2005, 141). In addition, the choice, or force,
14
15 to remain immobile demonstrates the importance of the features of particular places as well as
16
17 how different aspects of place shape the (re-)negotiation of staying. In sum, whilst
18
19 recognizing the importance of structural constraints which may impinge on staying processes,
20
21 staying also needs to be seen as an active process which can be shaped through the territorial
22
23 and relational aspects of place. Indeed, attachment to place or home, a sense of community or
24
25 belonging, perceptions and experiences of discrimination and the presence of family and
26
27 friends, as well as language, culture and traditions can all shape staying (Antonsich 2010;
28
29
30
31
32
33 Savage 2010)

34
35
36
37 Numerous studies concerned with ethnic residential mobility have identified the significance
38
39 of language in shaping the inward movement and clustering of ethnic minorities in particular
40
41 neighbourhoods (Rex and Moore 1967; Peach 1996). The protective effect of ethnic diversity
42
43 against racism has also been identified as an influence shaping ethnic residential mobility
44
45 patterns (see Clark and Ledwith 2007). In addition, preferences to reside in ethnic enclaves
46
47 and ethnic minority concentration neighbourhoods on the basis of securing access to
48
49 employment, housing, care, social support and to provide a sense of security and safety in the
50
51 context of disadvantage / discrimination elsewhere in the city have been extensively discussed
52
53 (see Boal 1976; Massey and Denton 1993; Peach 1996; Logan et al. 2002; Bolt et al. 2008).
54
55
56
57
58 Indeed, a lack of economic opportunities, institutional discrimination in housing markets and
59
60

1
2
3 the fear of discrimination in majority concentration neighbourhoods can lead to minorities
4 moving into, and remaining within, such areas (Phillips et al. 2007; Boschman and van Ham
5 2013).
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 However, whilst the relationship between mobility and place have been subject to
13 considerable discussion in respect of ethnic minority populations, the everyday lives and
14 experiences of stayers have yet to be adequately researched, nor the different aspects of place
15 and their role in the staying process (Stockdale and Haartsen 2018). Furthermore, Stockdale
16 and Haartsen (2018, 3) note how there are different spatial aspects to staying and how stayers
17 – by definition – may not be immobile. Rather, their daily life mobilities and use of virtual
18 and relational mobility may facilitate staying.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 ***2.2 Staying in superdiverse neighbourhoods***

31
32
33
34
35 The concept of superdiversity acknowledges that since the 1980s, there have been profound
36 quantitative and qualitative changes to global flows of people (Arnaut 2012, 3).
37 Superdiversity therefore describes the socio-cultural and demographic complexity driven by
38 international migration and internal differentiation within societies (Vertovec 2007). It is
39 associated with intra- and extra-group heterogeneity (Goodson and Grzymala-Kazłowska
40 2017). As such, it moves away from taking ethnic groups as the optimal unit for analysis
41 (Cooney 2009) and with individuals differing and identifying by characteristics such as
42 immigration status, rights and entitlements, gender, age, faith, reason for migration, class,
43 education levels and more (Wessendorf 2013).
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Superdiversity has been invoked in different ways, such as a contemporary synonym of
4 diversity, a backdrop for a study, a call for methodological reassessment, a way of simply
5 talking about more ethnicity and so on (Vertovec 2019, 125). This has led some to criticize
6 the term as no more than an amplification of multiculturalism (i.e. ‘more ethnicities’; see
7 Back 2015) or as overly focused on immigrant populations at the expense of the host
8 population, thereby concealing structural inequalities while offering individualizing
9 explanations for inequality, discrimination and labour market exploitation (Sepulveda et al.
10 2011; Raco et al. 2014). However, if applied appropriately – and with an awareness of such
11 concerns – a focus on superdiversity can help to draw attention to new social complexities by
12 moving beyond existing ethno-national approaches to place (Vertovec 2019).
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 New social complexities and the way in which they may shape migrant incorporation have
29 been captured through recent work on ‘arrival infrastructures’. For example, Saunders (2011)
30 has discussed the emergence of ‘arrival cities’, within which an optimistic narrative of ‘arrival
31 neighbourhoods’ is discussed in relation to their role in facilitating positive formal and
32 informal exchanges between newly arriving migrants and others (and which may or may not
33 contribute to processes of staying). However, more recent work by Meeus et al. (2019) has
34 highlighted how the reality of migrant incorporation can often be more challenging due to the
35 ‘politics of arrival’, and which encapsulates a politics of directionality, a politics of
36 temporality and a politics of subjectivity.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 In the context of superdiverse neighbourhoods, *directionality* is important as it refers to the
52 ways in which migrants (and non-migrants) are linked to a range of places due to their
53 networks, statuses, attachments and so on (Meeus et al., 2019). Hence whilst superdiverse
54 neighbourhoods can be presented as bounded territories (or ‘absolute space’) for political and
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 /or administrative purposes, they are also shaped relationally, acting as a node within wider
4
5 networks of interactions (Heley and Jones 2012). Consequently, there is a need to explore not
6
7 only territorial but also the relational aspects of superdiverse places in shaping processes of
8
9 staying.
10
11

12
13
14 *Temporality* is also a crucial aspect to consider when exploring staying as it highlights the
15
16 ‘messy’ everyday realities of individuals living in urban areas and which cannot simply be
17
18 reduced to citizenship providing permanence and stability (Meeus et al., 2019). In this
19
20 respect, superdiverse neighbourhoods are fast changing. They are viewed as areas of
21
22 transience for those passing through and arrival zones for new migrants from multiple
23
24 countries of origin (Robinson et al. 2007). They are often characterised by ‘newness’
25
26 (Phillimore 2015) whereby population churn means a proportion of residents are perpetually
27
28 new and where the speed and spread of change exceeds anything previously experienced
29
30 (Meissner and Vertovec 2015). Such arguments also reflect the assertion that the
31
32 diversification of diversity has generated greater population complexity and new patterns of
33
34 movement (Rutter et al. 2008; Arnaut 2013). This, Vertovec (2019) argues, implies
35
36 recognizing that people move out of and into contexts of diversity.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44
45 However, the assumption that superdiverse neighbourhoods are defined by the mobility of
46
47 migrant populations needs challenging. Taking Phillimore’s (2015) assertion that a proportion
48
49 of residents are perpetually new, the implication is that others living in such areas are not.
50
51 Yet, we know very little on the immobility and staying practices of those living in
52
53 superdiverse areas – and for migrants and non-migrants. Furthermore, there is a need to
54
55 consider how the changing features of superdiverse places may shape staying and which may
56
57 include particular forms of daily or virtual mobility. In such a way, it subsequently becomes
58
59
60

1
2
3 possible to develop new insights into the importance of different features of place in shaping
4
5 ‘staying processes’ through utilizing a whole community approach, and which moves beyond
6
7 existing ethno-national studies which focus on migrants per se.
8
9

10
11
12 The place-specific residential histories of individuals living in superdiverse neighbourhoods
13
14 are also important in shaping decisions to stay. Of the limited existing research which has
15
16 been undertaken to date on neighbourhood histories and the implications for settlement, this
17
18 has primarily focused on individuals’ previous experiences of diversity either in migrants’
19
20 countries of origin, or in places of transit migration (see, for example, Leitner 2012; Hoekstra
21
22 and Pinkster 2017). Wessendorf (2017, 10) has highlighted how migrants from white majority
23
24 contexts, for example in Eastern and Southern Europe, have gone through a process of
25
26 multicultural adaptation when settling in the UK. They have had to learn to adapt, interact and
27
28 “learn how to behave....and learn the rules” in social contexts with visible population
29
30 diversity (ibid., 10).
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Yet, to date, little focus has been placed on the relative importance of neighbourhood histories
39
40 in destination countries (for those who have moved from elsewhere), and how such
41
42 biographical experiences and practices in such areas serve to shape processes of staying in
43
44 superdiverse areas. Consequently, the research develops recent work by Hedman et al. (2015)
45
46 on the importance of neighbourhood histories in destination countries (for migrants), but in
47
48 terms of understanding processes of *staying* rather than in respect of a consideration of
49
50 residential mobility processes.
51
52
53
54
55

56 In relation to a politics of *subjectivity*, Meeus et al. (2019) discuss how the evolving
57
58 contextual aspects of the places in which individuals live, as well as the changing actions of
59
60

1
2
3 others, can shape processes of migrant incorporation (Meeus et al., 2019). In this respect,
4
5 superdiverse neighbourhoods are inherently diverse, accommodating migrants and longer
6
7 established minority groups but also non-migrant residents, whereby no ethnic group
8
9 predominates and diversity itself is the predominant neighbourhood identity. Such diversity
10
11 can attract some individuals who are visibly different on the basis of race, religion, gender or
12
13 lifestyle (Author 2018) and for such individuals to settle and develop a sense of belonging
14
15 through not 'sticking out' (Wessendorf 2017). Newcomers to superdiverse areas can feel
16
17 accepted in their (commonplace) 'otherness' (Wessendorf 2013; Ahmed 2000).
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Other infrastructures associated with of superdiverse neighbourhoods often combine with
25
26 differing aspects of population diversity to shape access to resources within and beyond the
27
28 neighbourhood. Indeed, the neighbourhood can be conceptualized as "a complex of
29
30 infrastructures for superdiversity" (Blommaert, 2014, 431) and with such infrastructure being
31
32 highly diverse including legal arrangements, cultural conventions, linguistic diversity, as well
33
34 as tangible objects and spaces including streets, schools, health centres, shops, specialist
35
36 support services, housing blocks and public parks (adapted from Arnaut et al. 2016, 17). This
37
38 can lead to individuals possessing a range of neighbourhood orientations (Cieslik 2015) and
39
40 activity spaces (Massey 1995). Such characteristics and orientations may, in turn, impinge on
41
42 the process of staying yet hitherto have been unexplored.
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Alongside migrant incorporation, Ryan's (2018) 'differentiated embedding' framework also
50
51 identifies how migrant settlement – and by implication migrant staying - is a contextual,
52
53 dynamic and differentiated process. As such, it highlights how migrants may negotiate
54
55 attachment and belonging in different social and structural settings, from the local (e.g.,
56
57 household, workplace, neighbourhood) and wider community to the transnational. It can also
58
59
60

1
2
3 involve periods of structural, relational, spatial and temporal embedding and / or dis-
4
5 embedding.
6
7
8
9

10 In the context of superdiverse neighbourhoods the framework is useful in that it draws
11 attention to the importance of place-specific structural and spatial opportunities, as well as
12 relational and transnational opportunities for embedding. Nevertheless, whilst temporal
13 aspects of embedding are recognised in respect of the importance of 'life events', there is a
14 need to extend such analyses to explore how staying may arise as a consequence of the
15 summation of multiple events, experiences and practices - for migrants and non-migrants -
16 which occur over time and in the context of the changing nature of superdiverse
17 neighbourhoods. Such experiences inform a constant negotiation and 'weighing up' by
18 individuals of whether to stay or leave.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 Together, what therefore emerges from integrating work on arrival infrastructures and
34 differentiated embedding is the need for a greater consideration of the territorial, relational
35 and temporal aspects of staying in relation to migrants and non-migrants in the context of
36 superdiverse neighbourhoods. In so doing, it then becomes possible to generate broader
37 insights into the necessary arrival infrastructures for staying (including the actions of other
38 migrants and non-migrants) as well as new insights into the temporal aspects of differentiated
39 embedding.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **3. Methods**

52
53
54
55

56 Two superdiverse neighbourhoods in the city of Birmingham, UK – which has a long history
57 of immigration and which is expected to be the first minority-majority neighbourhood by
58
59
60

1
2
3 2024 (Birmingham City Council 2013) – were selected for analysis. Each neighbourhood was
4
5 chosen based on their complex diversity among new migrant, minority and resident
6
7 populations, as well as contrasting deprivation levels and histories of immigration.
8
9

10
11
12 The first case study area was the neighbourhood of Lozells and East Handsworth (herein
13
14 “Handsworth”); the second was the neighbourhood of Ladywood. Handsworth is a traditional
15
16 reception area for immigrants. In Handsworth, immigration occurred in three main phases: the
17
18 arrival of post-Commonwealth migrants from the 1950s to 1970s, the dispersal of asylum
19
20 seekers from 1990 to the present day, and the arrival of EU8 migrants from 2004. Arguably,
21
22 superdiversity is particularly apparent. In contrast, Ladywood is an inner city ward
23
24 encapsulating a part of Birmingham City Centre. It is also a traditional area of immigration.
25
26 Whilst less diverse than Handsworth it continues to diversify and has the highest numbers of
27
28 immigrants who arrived in the UK between 2001 and 2011 compared to any other part of
29
30 Birmingham (see Table 1).
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 The superdiversity of each neighbourhood therefore comprises a quantitative dimension in
39
40 terms of the increase in arrival of migrants from a wider range of ethnicities and/or countries
41
42 of origin and a qualitative dimension encapsulating intra- and inter-group diversity. It is the
43
44 latter which is more important in delineating such neighbourhoods from other types of
45
46 neighbourhoods as there is an emphasis on how the intersection of differences that are evident
47
48 in individuals may produce new stratifications; new experiences of space and ‘contact’, new
49
50 forms of cosmopolitanism and multiculturalism and – in the context of this paper – new patterns
51
52 of mobility or staying (Vertovec 2019).
53
54
55
56
57

58 **Insert Table 1 here**
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 The research was undertaken between October 2016 and March 2018 and adopted a parallel
6 sequential methodology with each phase providing data shaping the development of the next.
7

8
9
10 The intention was to explore how staying was shaped in relation to the territorial and
11 relational aspects of superdiverse places.
12
13
14

15
16
17 First, an ethnographic mapping phase was conducted whereby time was spent walking around
18 the selected neighbourhoods, noting and mapping types of resources in each area and talking
19 to residents. Those participating in the research resided in each neighbourhood in order to
20 explore individuals' self-reported reasons for staying and to enable a discussion of issues
21 impinging on the staying process. The study also focused on migrants and non-migrants, as
22 many studies of neighbourhood superdiversity neglect the non-migrant population.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31
32
33 Second the investigator worked closely with three trained community researchers (CRs), who
34 were familiar with each neighbourhood and who facilitated the design and implementation of
35 a face-to-face questionnaire (152 questionnaires in total). Given that the purpose of the
36 questionnaire survey was to provide a broad exploratory overview of the range of influences
37 shaping residential mobility in superdiverse neighbourhoods and to inform follow-up in-depth
38 interviews, non-probability time-space / time-location sampling was adopted. Properly
39 executed, time / location sampling is a probability design applied to a limited non-household
40 population. Hence the CRs were given maps of each neighbourhood in order to identify and
41 develop a list of sites and locations of relevance in both Handsworth and Ladywood. The sites
42 and timings were randomised and a random sampling approach undertaken at each site and at
43 particular times.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In terms of the questionnaire sample, there were slightly more male than female participants
4 (82:70) and with roughly equal numbers of ‘long-term’ migrants (in UK more than five
5 years), ‘short term’ migrants (in UK less than 5 years) and non-migrants (born in the UK).
6
7 The age of individuals who participated ranged from 18 to 70 and with most in the 25-44 age
8 group. Those born abroad came from 43 different countries and with the majority (60%) in
9 some form of employment, with most of the other participants either unemployed (15%),
10 students (8.6%) or looking after the family (7%). Just over half of the sample lived in private
11 rented accommodation (55%), followed by social rented accommodation (20%). Two-thirds
12 of the overall sample had previously resided elsewhere in the UK.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Third, 40 in-depth interviews (conducted by the investigator and the CRs) were undertaken
27 with individuals resident in each of the neighbourhoods (20 interviews per neighbourhood)
28 and broadly reflective of the superdiversity apparent. Maximum variation sampling was used
29 to ensure heterogeneity in the composition of the sample in terms of origin, age, gender,
30 education levels and income, ethnic and linguistic backgrounds. This is a form of comparison-
31 focused sampling which selects cases to compare and contrast with a view to identifying
32 factors explaining similarities and differences (Patten 2001). The shared aspects that emerged,
33 despite the many intersecting axes of difference, hold increased authenticity and validity
34 because they do not result from sampling by pre-determined characteristics in a pre-defined
35 informant group (Author 2018). Interviewees were identified during the mapping stage,
36 through CR’s networks, community organisations, approaching individuals on the street and
37 snowballing.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 In summary, the sample of interviewees broadly reflected those who participated in the
57 questionnaire survey with individuals aged between 18 and 71 with 50% female and 50%
58
59
60

1
2
3 male. Again, the largest proportions of respondents were employed (67.5%), followed by
4 those looking after the family (17.5%). The majority lived in private rented accommodation
5 (45%). Respondents were drawn from 25 different countries (Handsworth 10; Ladywood 15)
6
7 in total and with one-third (33%) born in the UK. In terms of faith, Christian was most
8 frequent (47.5%) followed by No Religion (25%) and Muslim (25%) Virtually all of the
9 respondents reported an ability to speak English fluently.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 Respondents were asked to discuss the factors impinging on decisions to stay in the
20 neighbourhood. They were asked to describe all influences whether within or beyond the
21 neighbourhood. The research received ethical approval from the researcher's respective ethics
22 committee. All respondents were given oral and written information about the project,
23 including the option to withdraw up to 28 days after the interview and then asked to sign a
24 consent form. All data were anonymised.

25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35 Interview data were coded collectively using a systematic thematic analysis approach (Guest
36 et al. 2012) to identify the key issues raised by respondents. This involved interpretive code-
37 and-retrieve methods wherein the data were transcribed and codes and an interpretative
38 thematic analysis undertaken using MAXQDA software.

39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 **4. Results and analysis**

48 49 50 51 ***4.1 Staying as an active process informed by infrastructure and population diversity***

52
53
54
55
56 Whilst there was some evidence of structural constraints impinging on staying processes in
57 both case study neighbourhoods – and predominantly due to a lack of economic resources and
58
59
60

1
2
3 a dependency on social housing allocations - the research clearly highlighted how staying was
4 an active process for many living in areas of population superdiversity. Moreover, the
5 findings contradicted notions of superdiverse neighbourhoods as areas of continuous
6 population churn for all. Whilst a fifth of questionnaire respondents (n=30) had been in the
7 case study neighbourhoods for less than a year, just over 40% had been resident for more than
8 10 years (n=63), indicating evidence of staying. In addition, 56% of questionnaire
9 respondents in Ladywood and just over 75% of respondents in Handsworth stated that they
10 had both a choice and a desire to stay in their neighbourhoods, and with similar proportions of
11 migrants, minorities and non-migrants wishing to stay. Interview material also corroborated
12 findings from the questionnaire: similar proportions of interviewees (n=28/40) expressed a
13 wish to remain in either Handsworth or Ladywood.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Given evidence of staying as an active process, the next step involved uncovering the key
31 influences shaping individuals' decisions to stay in either Handsworth or Ladywood. In this
32 respect, the emphasis was on exploring the extent to which 'arrival infrastructures' could also
33 be constituted as 'staying infrastructures' (Saunders 2011; Blommaert 2014; Meeus et al.
34 2019) and which were facilitating processes of staying for both migrants and non-migrants
35 according to their 'social location' and particularly in relation to issues such as experiences of
36 discrimination and racism, age and gender (see Wessendorf 2017).
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 The research identified that the intersection of some of the subjectivities and temporalities of
50 arrival discussed by Meus et al. (2019) were serving to shape staying in superdiverse
51 neighbourhoods. For example, the social and physical emplacement of many migrants in
52 Handsworth was reflective of the long history of immigration into the neighbourhood, the
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 resulting visible diversity of the population and the diversity of infrastructure that had
4 developed over time (for example, local shops; religious institutions; cultural services etc.):
5
6
7
8
9

10 *It is like being in Turkey, I can get anything from my country...in Handsworth, there is*
11 *everything (for everyone) and so I can get what I need and want* (Interviewee 17,
12
13
14
15 Kurdish migrant, Handsworth)
16
17
18

19 These findings contrast markedly with research conducted on ethnic enclaves (for example,
20 see Massey and Denton, 1993) and the notion that single ethnic groups 'make place'. Rather,
21 it confirms work conducted in similar superdiverse settings by Author (2018) and Wessendorf
22 (2017; 2016). This has illustrated how more visible migrants have remained within
23 superdiverse neighbourhoods given that visible differences in the population are
24 unremarkable and with religious diversity, gender diversity and linguistic and lifestyle
25 diversity being the norm (Wessendorf 2016, 8-9).
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Nevertheless, over and above existing studies of superdiverse areas which have focused only
39 on migrant populations, the research also identified that a majority (c.60%) of non-migrant
40 White British participants who participated in the questionnaire survey and interviews had
41 also remained in the area due to the diversity of people, goods and services on offer. This was
42 reflected in the responses of those born in the area and those that had moved in from
43 elsewhere. With respect to the latter group, on average individuals identified that they had
44 lived in less diverse areas in the UK and cited the lack of diversity and conviviality
45 (Wessendorf, 2016) elsewhere, both in terms of population and in terms of infrastructure, as
46 key reasons to stay in either Handsworth or Ladywood:
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *Before I moved to Handsworth I was living in Selly Park, somewhere between Selly*
4 *Park and Stirchley. But I did not like that area; there were not any good shops*
5 *anywhere it wasn't as diverse or interesting* (Interviewee 1, White British,
6
7
8
9
10 Handsworth).

11
12
13
14
15 Moreover, the social location of the White British participants who participated in the
16
17 questionnaire and interview varied and with individuals having a range of different
18
19 qualifications and employment statuses. This is important as it has often been reported how
20
21 white middle class populations have sought forms of consumerist 'exoticism' associated with
22
23 increasing population diversity (see Wood et al. 2007; Horsti 2007). However, it was apparent
24
25 from the research that a search for exoticism was apparent in Handsworth (and to a lesser
26
27 extent Ladywood) across a much wider range of backgrounds than previously reported. As
28
29 such, individuals highlighted how access to a diverse range of everyday foodstuffs, local
30
31 services (for example, restaurants and cafes) and local employment generated pragmatic and
32
33 practical attachments to neighbourhood diversity and in turn facilitated processes of staying:
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 *I wouldn't want to live somewhere like York again where the demographic is quite*
41 *limited.....the little mini supermarkets and the shops you can get are also limited,*
42
43 *because the level of diversity isn't there* (Interviewee 11 White British, Handsworth).
44
45
46
47
48

49 A second key finding of relevance to 'staying infrastructures' and the subjectivities and
50
51 temporalities of staying became evident in relation to the case study neighbourhood of
52
53 Ladywood. Here population diversity was consistently discussed as relating to a small number
54
55 of dominant ethnic groups – namely White British, Indian, Sikh, and to a lesser extent, Black
56
57 Caribbean. In contrast to Handsworth many interviewees therefore argued that the transiency
58
59
60

1
2
3 and (population) churn of Ladywood was one of its key features – *“Ladywood is just like a*
4 *travelling through bit.....it’s not tied to anywhere enough”* (Interviewee 21, UK-born Indian,
5
6 Ladywood).
7
8
9

10
11
12 But in contrast to studies which have argued that high population turnover and neighbourhood
13 churn has a negative impact on neighbourhood experience and place attachment (Bailey et al.
14 2012), it was apparent that population turnover served as a key reason for many individuals
15 who were less visibly different (to the White British population) to settle and stay. As such,
16 perceptions and experiences of transiency provided the ability for individuals to ‘keep
17 themselves to themselves’ and to avoid others: *“as Eastern European’s we don’t especially*
18 *create places like community centres or whatever”* (Interviewee 36, Lithuanian migrant,
19 Ladywood). Indeed, this point relates to discussions of the importance of ‘intra-migrant
20 tensions’ associated with EU8 migrants (Grzymala-Kazlowska 2005): the research in
21 Birmingham highlighted how a number of EU8 migrants in Ladywood were staying in the
22 area as a result of previous tensions with other EU8 migrants in other neighbourhoods
23 elsewhere in the city and were using the neighbourhood to avoid other Eastern Europeans:
24 *“We moved away from Erdington because it is known as ‘Pole-ington’ because of the number*
25 *of Poles that live there. But it is not very safe and it is not very pleasant”* (Interviewee 16,
26 Polish migrant, Ladywood). This was despite the absence of opportunities for physical and
27 social emplacement such as the availability of relevant shops and culturally specific services
28 and facilities that reflected their presence in the Ladywood neighbourhood. Others also noted
29 prior intra-migrant tensions in previous neighbourhoods of residence based around age and
30 which had also served to shape processes of staying: *“the old people from the east when*
31 *communism was prevalent have a totally different state of mind”* (Interviewee 20, Polish
32 migrant, Ladywood).
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Moreover, whilst it has often been reported how many EU8 migrants who have moved to the
6 UK are often initially uncomfortable with visible diversity before undergoing a process of
7
8 'multicultural adaptation' (Wessendorf 2017), EU8 respondents indicated that rather than
9
10 moving away from areas of visible diversity, such as Handsworth (and to a lesser extent
11
12 Ladywood), they were now staying in such superdiverse neighbourhoods as a result of
13
14 previous experiences of discrimination elsewhere. Put simply, EU8 migrants argued that they
15
16 had previously experienced discrimination by the White British population in other parts of
17
18 the city. This subsequently meant that the increasing visibility of diversity in neighbourhoods
19
20 such as Handsworth and Ladywood was attractive and providing a new perspective on the
21
22 discrimination perspective on residential mobility set out by Boschman and van Ham (2013).
23
24 In essence, the perception of an emerging superdiverse neighbourhood identity acted to keep
25
26 individuals within the area, as opposed to a more monolithic identity associated with their
27
28 previous neighbourhoods:
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

*Because it is so diverse. I do not have to worry that I will be picked on for being
foreign. I have had friends who have decided to leave to move to perhaps cleaner
neighbourhoods where there are only English, only White people living there and now
they live in fear that maybe they are going to break their windows or shout at them
that they are from Poland (Interviewee 10, Polish migrant, Handsworth).*

51 Third, a further aspect of the temporalities of staying related to experiences of diversity.
52
53 Whilst other research has explored the importance of previous experiences of diversity either
54
55 in migrants' country of origin or in places of transit migration in shaping processes of
56
57 belonging (and which may contribute to staying; see Wessendorf 2017), there has been little
58
59
60

1
2
3 focus to date on how staying may be shaped by an individuals' history of being part of either
4 an invisible ethnic majority or visible minority in their previous neighbourhoods of residence.
5
6 In this respect, just over half of the sample of questionnaire and interviewee respondents
7
8 identified that they had lived in a previous neighbourhood in the UK before moving into
9
10 Handsworth or Ladywood.
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 The paper has already highlighted how White British non-migrant respondents had, on
18 average, lived in less diverse areas prior to moving into Handsworth or Ladywood (for those
19 who were not born in the neighbourhood). This was also the case for migrant and UK-born
20 non-White minority participants. Most EU8 migrants had been an invisible ethnic majority in
21 other neighbourhoods in Birmingham. Such experiences were strongly informing decisions to
22 now stay in Handsworth or Ladywood: *"Very often Polish people said that they were here to*
23 *help but they did not help. They just said nasty things and all they wanted was to make money*
24 *out of us"* (Interviewee 10, Polish migrant, Handsworth).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 More visible migrants and minorities also indicated that they had previously resided in a
39 range of different neighbourhoods in the UK, but with most previously living as a visible
40 minority in less diverse areas in either Birmingham or other parts of the West Midlands. By
41 and large, incidences of racism and anti-social behaviour were consistently raised as
42 characterising their experiences elsewhere before arriving in either Handsworth or Ladywood,
43 along with a lack of friends and a lack of ethnic or religious infrastructure: *"Before, I was*
44 *living in Quinton..... one time I opened my post and there was a spray inside because they*
45 *said they hated (it) when I was cooking, ...big discrimination"* (Interviewee 22, Portuguese
46 migrant, Ladywood). Consequently, they argued that they had subsequently experienced little,
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 if any discrimination based on their visible difference or their lifestyle since moving to either
4
5 neighbourhood. This was now informing decisions to stay.
6
7
8
9

10 In summary, key ‘staying infrastructures’ for many migrants and non-migrants in the context
11 of superdiverse neighbourhoods related to the presence of visible population diversity and a
12 neighbourhood identity based around diversity. In turn this highlighted the subjectivities of
13 territorial emplacement taking place through the development of pragmatic and practical
14 attachment to infrastructures of the neighbourhood, and especially shops and specialist
15 services. However, it was also apparent from the Ladywood neighbourhood that transience
16 and change also facilitated processes of staying for many who were less visibly different to
17 the White British population. As such, they argued they could ‘blend away’, ‘keep themselves
18 to themselves’ and avoid discrimination elsewhere in the city by other EU8 migrants or the
19 White British population. Hence the actions of other migrants and non-migrants – within and
20 beyond the case study neighbourhoods - were important in creating other types of
21 subjectivities relating to social emplacement and extending beyond the actions of state and
22 NGO employees (Meeus et al., 2019). Furthermore, a focus on neighbourhood histories also
23 confirmed the temporal dimensions of staying and how neighbourhood diversity was used as
24 a mechanism to avoid discrimination experienced previously in less diverse areas by different
25 migrants and minorities alike.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 ***4.2 Staying as a relational and temporal process***

50
51
52
53 Whilst the territorial presence of staying infrastructures was important in superdiverse
54 neighbourhoods, it was also apparent that staying processes were temporal and relational.
55
56 Indeed, extending Ryan’s (2018) arguments on the importance of temporal embedding / dis-
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 embedding, place belonging at the scale of the neighbourhood was becoming de-territorialised
4
5 for a number of interviewees over time. For some, the micro-scale of the home as a ‘staying
6
7 infrastructure’ was important for embedding and informed by a culmination of past and
8
9 current experiences of living with family and the promulgation of memory and nostalgia: “*My
10
11 memories are what’s shaped me...so if anyone moves in here and blows up the place, I’ll still
12
13 remember it and I will still have that belonging*” (Interviewee 38, UK-born Indian,
14
15 Ladywood). However, for others, the “openness of place and a related sense of mobility”
16
17 (Burrell 2016, 1608) were becoming as equally important as territorial infrastructures for
18
19 staying. Indeed, a majority of EU8, Chinese and White British interviewees perceived that
20
21 whilst the respective neighbourhoods of Handsworth and Ladywood were increasingly
22
23 reflective of population complexity and superdiversity, local facilities and services were not
24
25 always reflective of all groups in the area. Consequently, the directionality of such individuals
26
27 was evolving over time and with wider scales of activity becoming important as individuals
28
29 travelled to other parts of the city (and beyond) to find specialist food, clothes or for leisure:
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

*You can’t get pork in the area (Handsworth), you have to go to big
supermarkets elsewhere. They don’t have it in the shops across the street
(Interviewee 19, Chinese migrant, Handsworth)*

and

*We are missing the attractions and the things to do for the family. For that we have to
travel outside. But maybe that is because this place is dominated by the Asian culture
and they do not need those things (Interviewee 10, Polish migrant, Handsworth).*

1
2
3 In particular, directionalities associated with staying were most apparent in relation to the city
4 centre. This was seen as a key relational space which facilitated staying and which extended
5 beyond the availability of particular shops and services. Rather – and reflecting the
6 subjectivities of staying - it was a space where individuals who formed less of a critical mass
7 in either Handsworth or Ladywood – and who less able to join or ‘dock on’ to the dominant
8 ethnic groups in each neighbourhood (see Wessendorf 2017) – were able to develop a sense
9 of ease and belonging in the city centre because of its immigration-related diversity. This
10 provides a different perspective to work conducted elsewhere. For example, Butcher (2010)
11 has noted how immigrants in New Delhi, India divided the city into spaces of belonging
12 where they could ‘fit in’, ‘be themselves’ and be with people ‘like me’.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 Moreover, in the context of Birmingham and the case study neighbourhoods, a number of
29 further insights emerged in respect to the directionalities and subjectivities associated with
30 staying. First, it was apparent that White British individuals living in either Handsworth or
31 Ladywood often used the city centre as an extension of the neighbourhood to extend their
32 pragmatic attachment to their respective neighbourhoods. It was a place where they could buy
33 other goods and services, meet friends or indeed participate in festivals celebrating diversity
34 in the city. Hence consumerist exoticism was as much in evidence here as in their respective
35 neighbourhoods of residence. Second, for those migrants who were less visibly different –
36 including EU and EU8 migrants – the city centre was a space where ‘authenticity’ was
37 deemed to be more evident. Authenticity in relation to EU8 migrants has frequently been
38 discussed in respect of ‘unmarked whiteness’ and the extent to which individuals are deemed
39 to have ‘earned’ their place in society (Hubbard, 2005). But authenticity in this context related
40 to the perception of city centre spaces as ‘being more British’, in terms of ‘local customs and
41 features’ and as summarised by one EU8 migrant interviewee: “*So as you're walking past the*
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *shop (in Ladywood) I do not necessarily think it is... pleasant, hygienic... If you go to the city*
4 *centre nobody does that, right? There are no food, vegetables things like that outside”*
5
6
7 (Interviewee 12, Polish migrant, Ladywood).
8
9

10
11
12 However, authenticity did not just apply to goods and services on offer in the city centre. It
13
14 also related to social relations. Several EU and EU8 migrants highlighted how they felt more
15
16 comfortable in the city centre given that the ‘British ways of life and doing things’ were
17
18 perceived as being more evident: *“In the city centre you can see much more the British people*
19 *and stuff, nobody points at you but outside....well.....my sister came to visit and we were*
20 *sitting out there (in Ladywood) and a few guys who were clearly not Westerners were*
21 *pointing at her and staring. And my sister said: ‘Look, I feel uncomfortable, what are they*
22 *doing?’”* (Interviewee 25, Spanish migrant, Ladywood).
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31
32
33 Yet it was clear that the city centre as an ‘authentic space’ was arguably a more normative
34
35 concept for interviewees and that in reality it was performing an alternative function as a
36
37 multicultural space of adaptation. In essence, it was a space where individuals with little
38
39 experience of diversity hitherto became accustomed and adjusted to population diversity and
40
41 complexity more gradually – a space which was territorial in nature; used relationally by
42
43 individuals beyond their neighbourhoods of residence; and a temporal space in respect of
44
45 diversity becoming increasingly apparent but which also reflected customs and features that
46
47 were perceived as reflective of urban environments in the UK: *“Here, in England the cities*
48 *are organised differently....you don't have the Roman structure....but you do have the towers,*
49 *skyscrapers as a western reference and this was important to me”* (Interviewee 27, Italian
50
51 migrant, Ladywood). Such arguments therefore reflect Ryan’s (2018) focus on the importance
52
53 of temporal embedding but with the research in Birmingham highlighting how this can relate
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 to the superdiverse neighbourhood within which individuals reside as well as other
4 relational spaces (such as the city centre), both of which are changing over time and which are
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

to the superdiverse neighbourhood within which individuals reside as well as other relational spaces (such as the city centre), both of which are changing over time and which are impinging on the experiences of individuals using such spaces and subsequently informing decisions to stay (or leave).

Finally, for a number of migrants who were more visibly different and who had moved to Handsworth or Ladywood on the basis of the opportunity to avoid racial harassment elsewhere, the city centre was perceived as providing added value in that it was deemed to be diverse and also safe. Consistent reference was made to the visibility of policing in the city centre as well as the presence of CCTV. This provided a form of reassurance: *“We can’t go out in Ladywood after 6 o’clock / 7 when it gets dark...its really not safe.....but in the city centre there are more cameras, it feels more safe”* (Interviewee 6, Cameroonian migrant, Ladywood). Yet it is important to acknowledge that such perspectives were not universally held and were reflective of migrants’ social location, and in particular their previous experiences in the city. For example, those who had lived in Birmingham for a longer period of time argued that they had previously been subject to verbal and physical discrimination in the city centre and therefore were more reluctant to use such a space.

In summary, this section has specifically focused on the temporal aspects of staying and the significance of migrants and non-migrants’ evolving directionalities in terms of the ways in which other spaces in the city – and particularly the city centre – were utilised to facilitate processes of staying. However, drawing on Ryan (2018), it was clear that whilst the changing nature of the city centre – and the increasing prevalence of diversity - served to embed some individuals, for others their experiences had been less positive over time. This was leading to active dis-embedding given the challenges of social and physical emplacement and with some

1
2
3 evidence of a reinforcement of territorial embedding within their respective neighbourhoods
4
5 given the presence of population diversity and infrastructures for staying.
6
7
8
9

10 **5. Conclusion**

11
12
13

14 This paper has problematized the notion of superdiverse neighbourhoods being defined by
15 “newness” (Phillimore, 2015) and developed new and hitherto less recognised insights into
16
17 the territorial and relational aspects of superdiverse places in shaping processes of staying for
18
19 migrants and non-migrants. Through adopting a ‘whole community’ approach the research
20
21 also identified that there is considerable agency associated with staying in superdiverse
22
23 neighbourhoods, although wider structural forces associated with access to housing and
24
25 economic resources may shape decisions to stay or leave.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 By and large, decisions to stay in superdiverse neighbourhoods were intentional but complex
34
35 and shaped over time through past and current experiences of population diversity,
36
37 experiences of discrimination and access to particular neighbourhood infrastructures. As such,
38
39 beyond the importance of economic capital in terms of housing affordability and civic capital
40
41 providing permanence and stability (Meeus et al. 2019), it was apparent that the social
42
43 location of individuals (Wessendorf 2017) and their respective social and cultural capital was
44
45 also significant in shaping neighbourhood experiences. Indeed, inter and intra-migrant
46
47 relations, acceptance of visible difference and the ability to generate pragmatic and practical
48
49 attachment to the neighbourhood in respect of housing (and family), shops and specialist
50
51 services were all important for staying.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Furthermore through drawing on recent work associated with ‘arrival infrastructures’ and the
4
5 ‘politics of arrival’ (Saunders 2011; Meeus et al. 2019), as well as Ryan’s (2018) conceptual
6
7 framework of ‘differentiated embedding’, it was evident that the changing biographies of
8
9 individuals and places also shaped a ‘politics of staying’. The directionality and subjectivities
10
11 of migrants and non-migrants in the sample towards both ‘staying infrastructures’ and
12
13 specific relational spaces, such as the city centre, were fundamental in developing a sense of
14
15 ease and belonging, feelings of authenticity and adaptation to immigration-related diversity
16
17 over time. The significance of experiences in previous neighbourhoods was also recognised
18
19 although the situation was multifaceted and with the privileging of whiteness for certain
20
21 groups of individuals (and especially those from EU8 countries) no longer being as influential
22
23 in shaping positive settlement experiences in less diverse areas.
24
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 Finally, at a broader conceptual level the paper has highlighted how temporal aspects of
32
33 staying and embedding are not a ‘once and for all’ process but arise as a result of the
34
35 summation of experiences – shaped territorially and relationally – and with processes of
36
37 embedding and dis-embedding often occurring processually (over time) or simultaneously in
38
39 different activity spaces (such as the home, neighbourhood, city centre etc.; Massey 1995).
40
41 Nevertheless, further research is required to confirm such trends in other contexts of
42
43 superdiversity and to explore the ways in which neighbourhood histories, the place-specific
44
45 infrastructures of superdiverse neighbourhoods and other relational spaces shape processes of
46
47 staying for different groups of residents.
48
49
50
51

52 53 **6. Bibliography**

54
55
56
57
58 Adey, P. 2010. *Mobility*. Abingdon: Routledge.
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Adey, P. 2006. "If Mobility is Everything Then it is Nothing: Towards a Relational Politics of
6 (Im)mobilities," *Mobilities* 1 (1): 76-94.
7
8
9

10
11
12 Ahmed, S. 2000. *Strange Encounters: Embodied Other in Post-Coloniality*. New York:
13 Routledge.
14
15

16
17
18
19 Antonsich, M. 2010. "Searching For Belonging – An Analytical Framework." *Geography*
20 *Compass* 2 (6): 644-659.
21
22
23

24
25
26 Arnaut, K. 2012. "Super-diversity: elements of an emerging perspective." *Diversities* 14 (2):
27 1-16.
28
29

30
31
32
33 Arnaut, K., Karrebæk, M., and Spotti, M. 2016. "Engaging superdiversity: The poiesis-
34 infrastructure nexus and language practices in combinatorial spaces." In *Engaging*
35 *superdiversity: Recombining spaces, times and language practices*, edited by K. Arnaut, M.
36 Karrebæk, and M. Spotti, 3–24. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
37
38
39

40
41
42
43
44 Author, 2018.
45
46

47
48
49 Back, L. 2015. "Losing Culture or Finding Super-Diversity?" *Discover Society* 20, 2015.
50
51

52
53
54 Bailey, N., Kearns, A., and Livingstone, M. 2012. "Place attachment in deprived
55 neighbourhoods: The impacts of population turnover and social mix." *Housing Studies* 27 (2):
56 208–231.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Beck, U., and Grande, E. 2010 “Varieties of Second Modernity: The Cosmopolitan Turn in
6 Social and Political Theory and Research.” *The British Journal of Sociology* 61 (3): 409–443.
7
8

9
10
11
12 Blommaert, J., 2014. “Infrastructures of superdiversity: conviviality and language in an
13 Antwerp neighborhood.” *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 17 (4), 431–451.
14
15

16
17
18
19 Birmingham City Council 2013. *Population and Migration Topic Report*. Birmingham:
20 Birmingham City Council.
21
22

23
24
25
26 Boal, F.W. 1976. “Ethnic residential segregation”. In *Social Areas in Cities*, edited by D.T.
27 Herbert, D.T. and R.J. Johnston, 41-79. John Wiley: London.
28
29

30
31
32
33 Bolt, G., Kempen, R., and van Ham M. 2008. “Minority ethnic groups in the Dutch housing
34 Market; Spatial segregation, relocation dynamics and housing policy.” *Urban Studies* 45 (7):
35 1359-1384.
36
37
38

39
40
41
42 Boschman, S., and van Ham, M. 2013. *Neighbourhood Selection of Non-Western Ethnic*
43 *Minorities: Testing the Own-Group Preference Hypothesis Using a Conditional Logit Model*.
44 IZA Discussion Paper No. 7526. Bonn: IZA.
45
46
47

48
49
50
51 Burrell, K. 2016. “Lost in the ‘churn’? Locating neighbourliness in a transient
52 neighbourhood,” *Environment and Planning A* 48 (8): 1599-1616.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Butcher, M. 2010. "Navigating 'New' Delhi: Moving between difference and belonging in a
4 globalizing city." *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 31 (5): 507–524.
5
6
7

8
9
10 Cieslik, A. 2015. "The visions of the neighborhood: Super-diversity in Astoria, NY." Paper
11 presented at *Migrants in the City conference*, Sheffield, October 5-6.
12
13
14

15
16
17 Clark, W.A.V. and Ledwith, V. 2006. "Mobility, housing stress, and neighborhood contexts:
18 Evidence from Los Angeles." *Environment and Planning A* 38 (6): 1077-1093.
19
20
21

22
23
24 Cooney, M. 2009. "Ethnic Conflict Without Ethnic Groups: A Study in Pure Sociology."
25 *British Journal of Sociology* 60 (3): 473–492.
26
27
28

29
30
31 Coulter, R., van Ham, M., and Findlay, A.M. 2016. "Re-thinking residential mobility:
32 Linking lives through time and space." *Progress in Human Geography* 40 (3): 352-374.
33
34
35

36
37
38 Coulter, R., van Ham, M., and Findlay, A.M. 2013. *New Directions for Residential Mobility*
39 *Research: Linking Lives through Time and Space*. IZA Discussion Paper, No. 752. Bonn:
40 IZA.
41
42
43

44
45
46 Cresswell, T., and Merriman, P. 2011. "Introduction." In *Geographies of mobilities:*
47 *Practices, spaces, subjects*, edited by T. Cresswell and P. Merriman, 1–15. Farnham, UK:
48 Ashgate.
49
50
51

52
53
54
55
56 Cresswell, T., 2006. *On the Move: Mobility in the Modern Western World*. Abingdon:
57 Routledge.
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Faist, T. 2013. "The mobility turn: a new paradigm for the social sciences?" *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 36 (11): 1637-1646.

Goodson, L., and Grzymala-Kazłowska, A. 2017. "Researching Migration in a Superdiverse Society: Challenges, Methods, Concerns and Promises." *Sociological Research Online* 22 (1): 1-13.

Grzymala-Kazłowska, A. 2005. "From ethnic cooperation to in-group competition: undocumented Polish workers in Brussels." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 31 (4): 675–697.

Guest, G., MacQueen, K.M., and Namey, E.E. 2012. *Applied Thematic Analysis*. Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA.

Hedman, L., Manley, D., van Ham, M., and Osth, J. 2015. "Cumulative exposure to disadvantage and the intergenerational transmission of neighbourhood effects." *Journal of Economic Geography* 15 (1): 195–215.

Heley, J., and Jones, L. 2012. "Relational rurals: some thoughts on relating things and theory in rural studies." *Journal of Rural Studies* 28 (3): 208–217.

Hoekstra, M.S., and Pinkster, F.M. 2017. "'We want to be there for everyone': imagined spaces of encounter and the politics of place in a super-diverse neighbourhood." *Social and Cultural Geography*. doi: 10.1080/14649365.2017.1356362

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Horsti, K. 2007. "Migrant Integration in Rural Areas: Evidence from New Countries of Immigration." *International Journal on Multicultural Societies (IJMS)* 9 (1): 113-130.

Hubbard, P. 2005. "Accommodating otherness: anti-asylum centre protest and the maintenance of white privilege." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 30 (1): 52-65.

Kley S., and Mulder, C. 2010. "Considering planning, and realizing migration in early adulthood. The influence of life-course events and perceived opportunities on leaving the city in Germany." *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment* 25: 73-94.

Leitner, H. 2012. "Spaces of encounters: Immigration, race, class, and the politics of belonging in small-town America." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 102 (4): 828-846.

Logan, J., Zhang, W., and Alba, R. 2002. "Immigrant enclaves and ethnic communities in New York and Los Angeles." *American Sociological Review* 67 (2): 299-322.

Looker, D., and Naylor, T. 2009. "At risk of being rural? The experience of rural youth in a risk society." *Journal of Rural and Community Development* 4 (2): 39-64.

Massey, D. 2005. *For Space*. Sage: London.

1
2
3 Massey, D. 1995. "The conceptualisation of place." In *A Place in the World*, edited by D.
4
5 Massey and P. Jess, 45-85. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
6
7

8
9
10 Massey, D. 1993. "Power-geometry and a progressive sense of place." In *Mapping the*
11
12 *Futures: Local Cultures, Global Change*, edited by J. Bird, B. Curtis, T. Putnam, G.
13
14 Robertson and L. Tickner, 59-69. London: Routledge.
15
16

17
18
19 Massey, D., and Denton, N. 1993. *Apartheid American Style*. Cambridge: MA: Harvard
20
21 University Press.
22
23

24
25
26 Meeus, B., Arnaut, K. and van Heur, B. (2019) "Migration and the Infrastructural Politics of
27
28 Urban Arrival." In *Arrival Infrastructures: Migration and Urban Social Mobilities*, edited by
29
30 B. Meeus, K. Arnaut and B. van Heur, 1-32. Palgrave MacMillan: London.
31
32

33
34
35 Meissner, F., and Vertovec, S. 2015. "Comparing super-diversity." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*
36
37 38 (4): 541-555.
38
39

40
41
42 Merriman, P. 2012. *Mobility, Space and Culture*. London: Routledge.
43
44

45
46
47 Milbourne, P., and Kitchen, L. 2014. "Rural mobilities: Connecting movement and fixity in
48
49 rural places." *Journal of Rural Studies* 34 (4): 326-336.
50
51

52
53
54 Miller, B., and Ponto, J. 2016. "Mobility among the spatialities." *Annals of the American*
55
56 *Association of Geographers* 106 (2): 266-273.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Morse, C.E., and Mudgett, J. 2018. "Happy to Be Home: Place-Based Attachments, Family
4 Ties, and Mobility among Rural Stayers." *The Professional Geographer* 70 (2): 261-269.
5
6
7

8
9
10 Patten, M. 2001. *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods* (2nd Edition). Sage:
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Thousand Oaks, CA.

Peach, C. 1996. "Does Britain have ghettos?" *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 21 (1): 216-235.

Phillimore, J. 2015. "Delivering maternity services in an era of super-diversity: the challenges of novelty and newness." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 38 (4): 568-582.

Phillips, D., Davis, C., and Ratcliffe, P. 2007. "British Asian Narratives of Urban Space." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 32 (2): 217-234.

Raco, M., Kesten, J., and Colomb, C. 2014. *Urban policies on diversity in London, United Kingdom*. Bartlett School of Planning, University College London: London.

Rex, J., and Moore, R. 1967. *Race, Community and Conflict*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Robinson, D., Reeve, K., and Casey, R. 2007. *The Housing Pathways of New Migrants*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation: York.

1
2
3 Rutter, J., Latorre, M., and Sriskandarajah, D., 2008. *Beyond Naturalisation: Citizenship*
4 *Policy in an Age of Super Mobility*. Institute for Public Policy Research: London.
5
6
7

8
9
10 Ryan, L., 2018. "Differentiated embedding: Polish migrants in London negotiating belonging
11 over time" *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 44 (2): 233-251.
12
13
14

15
16
17 Saunders, D. 2011. *Arrival City: How the Largest Migration in History is Reshaping Our*
18 *World*. Windmill Books: London.
19
20

21
22
23
24 Savage, M. 2010. "The politics of elective belonging." *Housing, Theory and Society* 27 (2):
25 115–161.
26
27

28
29
30 Sepulveda L., Syrett, S., and Lyon, F., 2011. "Population superdiversity and new migrants'
31 enterprise: the case of London." *Entrepreneurial Regional Development* 23 (7–8): 469–497.
32
33
34

35
36
37 Stockdale, A., and Haartsen T. 2018. "Editorial introduction: Putting rural stayers in the
38 spotlight." *Population, Space and Place* doi.org/10.1002/psp.2124.
39
40
41

42
43
44 Thomas, M., Stillwell, J., and Gould, M. 2015. "Modelling mover/stayer characteristics
45 across the life course using a large commercial sample." *Population, Space and Place* 22 (6):
46 584–598.
47
48
49

50
51
52
53 Urry, J. 2007. *Mobilities*. Polity Press: Cambridge.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Urry, J. 2000. *Sociology beyond societies: mobilities for the twenty-first century*. Routledge:
4
5 London.

6
7
8
9
10 Vertovec, S., 2019. "Talking around super-diversity" *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 42 (1): 125-
11
12 139.

13
14
15
16
17 Vertovec, S. 2007. "Super-diversity and its implications" *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30 (6):
18
19 1024-1054.

20
21
22
23
24 Wessendorf, S. 2017. "Migrant belonging, social location and the neighbourhood: Recent
25
26 migrants in East London and Birmingham." *Urban Studies*
27
28 doi.org/10.1177/0042098017730300

29
30
31
32
33 Wessendorf, S. 2016. "Settling in a super-diverse context: Recent migrants' experiences of
34
35 conviviality" *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 37 (5): 449–463.

36
37
38
39
40 Wessendorf, S. 2013. "Commonplace diversity and the 'ethos of mixing': Perceptions of
41
42 difference in a London neighbourhood." *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 20:
43
44 407–422.

45
46
47
48
49 Wood, P., Landry, C., and Bloomfield, J. 2007. *Cultural diversity in Britain: A toolkit for*
50
51 *cross-cultural co-operation*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation: York.

Table 1. Characteristics of neighbourhoods

City	Neighbourhoods
Birmingham: 2 nd largest city in UK. 1,073,045 residents, 22.2% foreign born; 46.9% of individuals	Lozells and East Handsworth: 31,074 residents, 44.9 % migrants and 89.2% of individuals BME from 170 different countries (2011). Long history of immigration and deprivation.
have an ethnic minority (BME) background from 187 countries (2011).	Ladywood: 30,133 residents, 37.1% migrants and 50.6% BME from 130 different countries (2011). More recent history of immigration and mixed levels of deprivation.